

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/876,915	06/08/2001	Robert G. Wilhelm	2000-008/9/14 1111		
7590 07/02/2004			EXAMI	EXAMINER	
Steve Gardne, Esquire			DESIRE, GREGORY M		
Kilpatrick Stockton, LLP 1001 West Fourth Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Winston-Salem, NC 27101-2400			2625	9	
			DATE MAIL ED: 07/02/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/876,915	WILHELM, ROBERT G.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory M. Desire	2625	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 Jules</u> 2a) □ This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This 3) □ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>30</u> is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,11,15-24,26-29 and 31</u> is/are rejection of the company of	cted.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2001 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction to the correction of	☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		

Art Unit: 2625

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1, 3-6 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sasaki (6,373,491).

Regarding claims method claims 1 and 20 Sasaki discloses,

Obtaining coordinate data and normal vector data associated with each point of a starting set of points, where the starting set comprises at least three non-linear points (note fig. 15 and col. 13 lines 10-20 lines cite coordinate data and normal vector of a starting set); and

Determining a first estimated relationship between the pluralities of points based on the coordinate data and the normal vector data associated with the starting set o points (note col. 14 lines 1-8, cites coordinate point and normal vector is used to compose a shape, thus determining a first relationship between plurality of points and normal vector).

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claim 3 Sasaki discloses,

Where the starting set further comprises points defining a boundary of the plurality of points (note figs 19a-19d in connection with col. 18 lines 1-29, polygon shows point defining boundary of said points).

Regarding claim 4 Sasaki discloses,

Where determining the first estimated relationship between the plurality of points further comprises interpolating between the starting set of points according to a predetermined estimator that incorporates the obtained coordinate data and the obtained normal vector data and generates estimated coordinate data and estimated normal vector data (note col. 8 lines 13-24, determining shape comprise interpolating between set of points from coordinate data and vector data).

Regarding method claim 5 Sasaki discloses,

Where the predetermined estimator comprises a function for representing a multi-dimensional relationship (note col. 8 line 5-12, the examiner interprets function represent three-dimensional shape as multi-dimensional relationship).

Regarding claim 6 Sasaki discloses,

Where the predetermined estimator comprises a cubic spline function (note col. 20 lines 1-3 and 20-45, examiner interprets third order bezier curve as a cubic spline function).

Art Unit: 2625

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 2, 11, 15-19, 21-24, 26-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in further view of Nishikawa (6,556,198).

Regarding method claims 2 and 17, computer readable medium claim 21, system claim 24 and 31 Sasaki discloses,

First estimated relationship between pluralities of points. However is silent teaching a point having a maximum estimated error within the first estimated relationship and obtaining coordinate when target point is greater than a predetermined error limit. Nishikawa discloses a point having a maximum estimated error within the first estimated relationship (note col. 9 lines 6-20, examiner interprets farthest point as maximum estimated error) and obtaining coordinate when target point is greater than a predetermined error limit (note fig. 27). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art to include a point having a maximum estimated error within the first estimated relationship and obtaining coordinate when target point is greater than a predetermined error limit in the system of Sasaki as evidenced by Nishikawa. Sasaki discloses first estimated relationship between pluralities. Nishikawa

Art Unit: 2625

in the same field of endeavor discloses obtaining coordinate of target points to optimize interpolation process (note col. 10 lines 5-7).

Regarding method claim 11 Sasaki and Nishikawa discloses,

Where the predetermined error limit corresponds to a predetermined level of accuracy (note Nishikawa fig. 27 S814)

Regarding claims 15 and 19 Sasaki and Nishikawa discloses,

Removing data associated with a first estimated relationship between pluralities of points based on normal vector data (note Nishikawa col. 2 lines 33-35 examiner interprets changing step, where the changed data is removed to read on the claim).

Regarding claims method16, computer readable claim 21 and system claim 24 and 31

Sasaki is silent disclosing automatically determining whether further measurements are required base on normal vector data. However Nishikawa discloses automatic determining of further measurements (note col. 10 lines 5-7, 46-50 and col. 11 lines 53-55). Lines perform automatic determining of optimum algorithm based on input, thus constantly achieving high speed processing. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include an automatic determining of further measurement in the system of Sasaki as evidenced by Nishikawa. Achieving constant high speed processing (note Nishikawa col. 11 lines 55-57) would be desirable feature in Sasaki's image processor improving efficiency as in Nishikawa.

As to local rate of change with respect to vector (note Nishikawa optimum algorithm).

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding method claim 18, computer-readable medium claim 23 and system claim 27 Sasaki and Nishikawa discloses,

Where the predetermined measurement criteria comprise criteria selected

From the group consisting of physical limitation error limitations, and ruled-based

Criteria (note Nishikawa col. 10 lines 11-15 optimum algorithm examiner interprets as rule based criteria).

Regarding computer-readable medium claim 22 and system claim 28 Sasaki and Nishikawa discloses.

Where the predetermined estimator comprises a function for representing a multi-dimensional relationship (note Sasaki col. 8 line 5-12, the examiner interprets function represent three-dimensional shape as multi-dimensional relationship).

Regarding system claim 26 Sasaki and Nishikawa discloses,

An adaptive sampling mechanism having predetermined criteria (which read on Nishikawa's (fig. 16), wherein an adaptive sampling mechanism is operative to generate a measurement decision based on an evaluation of coordinate data and normal vector data with respect to the predetermined measurement criteria (note Nishikawa col. 10 lines 25-50, generates results based on input data of data measured).

Regarding system claim 29 Sasaki and Nishikawa discloses,

Art Unit: 2625

Where the predetermined estimator comprises a cubic spline function (note Sasaki col. 20 lines 1-3 and 20-45, examiner interprets third order bezier curve as a cubic spline function).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claim 30 is allowed.
- 6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: Prior art fails to discloses limitations of error limitation as claimed in combination with other limitations.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

7. Claims 7-10, 12-14 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding method claim 7 and system claim 25,

Prior art fails to disclose the error relationship as claimed. Claims 8-10 depend on claim 7. Therefore are also objected.

Art Unit: 2625

Regarding claim 12,

Prior art fails to discloses a second estimated relationship between plurality of points representative of a subset of the plurality of points based on the second set of coordinate data and normal vector in combination with other limitations. Claims 13-14 depend on claim 12. Therefore are also allowable.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (703) 308-9586. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) Second Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2625

Examiner Art Unit 2625

Dogry Dais

G.D. June 27, 2004